

Charlotte Democrat.

CHARLOTTE, N. C.

FOR THE CHARLOTTE DEMOCRAT.

To Sustain Monogamy.

There were existing in ancient Attica within a period of two hundred years, twenty-eight natives, it is said, who have not been equalled for abilities by any twenty-eight whom the whole world has since produced in more than two thousand years. This remarkable fact has recently been ascribed to monogamy, the one wife system.

The question is, how shall that system be naturally and more faithfully practiced than it now is in modern christian countries. The answer is obvious: by supplying satisfactory wives. How is that to be effected? By an education of the females physically as well as mentally, and thus qualify them to practice fully all the duties of a helpmate, leaving no cause for complaint to the husband that would induce or tempt him to seek carnal services and a full reciprocity of love and affection outside of those of his wife. As no nation can be the mother of a great people whose women are enervated by over-brain-working to the neglect of the working of the body, so no nation will faithfully conform to the system of monogamy whose women are *top-heavy*, sickly, peevish and fretful. The fidelity of the husband to the wife but too often depends upon the fidelity of his wife to the laws of health. He is not content with mere Platonic love. The women of ancient Attica were physically vigorous; but few except Aspasia, figured intellectually; and the Romans of old, who conquered the world, admired women with small foreheads, and especially honored those who were of exuberant manly and practical house-wifery. The jewels of a Roman lady were her vigorous sons, and her supreme devotion and fidelity to her husband.

To sustain monogamy then, the true basis of a proper social state, of physical vigor are required—of loveliness, and of skill in domestic affairs. That these invaluable requirements may be realized must depend upon maternal training—that the high hopes of the founders of our Republic may not fail, a great duty is imposed upon mothers. The daughters are, in a high degree, the reflection of the health, the amiability and the domestic virtues of their mothers under the system of monogamy.

I am much pleased to see that the female sex is fast waking up to the requirements of their new circumstances; yea, even surpassing the male sex in proper mental and physical training.

Charlotte, N. C. An Old Man.

A Winning Ticket.

We repeat that the winning ticket in North Carolina at the next election, is Thomas J. Jarvis for Governor and Julian S. Carr for Lieut. Governor.

We confess, (at least one of us do), that heretofore we have never been much big headed about Jarvis, but upon a careful and honest review of his administration as Governor of North Carolina, candor compels us to say, and we say it cheerfully, that Mr Jarvis made us the best, wisest and most successful Governor North Carolina ever had.

It is not because Mr Carr is a philanthropist and possesses a big heart that we wish him to be placed on the ticket as Lieut. Governor, but because he is a typical North Carolina man and possesses to a large degree those advanced ideas of progress, that when wise and judiciously applied cannot fail to place his State in the front rank where God and nature intended her. By the mysterious ways of Providence he may be Governor. A man who has managed his own great business with such wonderful success, can be safely trusted to manage the affairs of the State.

[We do not believe that Jarvis would accept a nomination for Governor.]

Tainted with Fraud.

The colored people in this section, and we learn in other sections, are undergoing quite an excitement, occasioned by the coming among them of one Thos. Canada, a colored lawyer of Granville county, and representing to them that he is a glowing rich firm, who will, upon proper application, supply them with money to buy land. His proposition, as we learn from some of the colored people, is about this: He proposes to take all applications for money, upon the payment by the applicant of a sum not exceeding \$15. He reports that all applications will be considered, and that a man is to follow him for the purpose of ascertaining the value of any lands that the applicant may wish to buy, before the money (to be loaned) is forthcoming. If a purchase is made, this fee of \$15, or any other amount agreed upon, is to be paid back to the applicant; but in case no purchase is made the fee is to be held by Canada, for his trouble. This is about the way it is reported to us, and if the statements are true, we do not hesitate to say that we are in a glaring fraud, and a delusion, fixed up for the purpose of defrauding the credulous colored people out of their money. We learn that Canada succeeded in getting a number to make applications in this immediate section. It is our opinion that they have seen their money the last time, unless this exposure may arouse Canada to return it to them.

[It is nothing but a scheme to rob the negroes, but as there is a negro at the head of it, it is not worth while for white people to bother themselves to wage negroes, as they will not believe what a white man says.]

PARDONS BY THE PRESIDENT.—In granting the pardon to John Brooks, convicted of violating the Internal Revenue laws in Georgia, and sentenced March 15th, 1887, to seven months imprisonment, the President says: "It seems to me that the law is not administered in the best manner, when, as in this case, a man of previous good character, and a law-abiding citizen, is sentenced to seven months imprisonment for working for others one day in an illicit distillery, especially when he pleads guilty, shows evidence of sincere repentance, and discloses the names of his employers, and when, by his imprisonment, four helpless, motherless children are left to the care of strangers."

[That's sensible talk.]

Life is made burdensome to the freshmen at Yale College by the hazing tactics of the sophomores. Drills with broomsticks, and pokers, compulsory oratory and other disagreeable proceedings are features in the programme that the freshmen are compelled to perform.

[Why should any intelligent or prudent parent send his boy to such a place, to be degraded and demoralized.]

Judge Merrimon and Disagreeing Jurors.

From the Raleigh Biblical Recorder.

North Carolina has been fortunate in her judiciary. Only in a few instances have her rights been violated by corrupt years that immediately followed the war, when affairs were in an unsettled condition. Then, sometimes they would forget their high responsibility. Things are better now. Since the days of Gaston and Badger, we have not had a purer judiciary. All of them are not strong, but all are just. Some of them have not been surpassed. Of the Judges of the Superior Court, Judge Walter Clark has, in many respects, placed himself at the head. He has rendered most efficient service to his State by his just decisions, and the integrity with which he has brought to justice some who hitherto have laughed defiance at the law, has greatly endeared him to all North Carolinians who have the good of the commonwealth at heart.

But the object of this article is not to speak particularly of the excellence of our judiciary, nor of Judge Clark. We merely wish to call the attention of the people to an act of kindness done them by Judge J. H. Merrimon, also an able Judge. All honor to him. We are pleased to witness his fidelity to his high position and to the people who placed him there. At the Superior Court last week, a man was indicted for selling whiskey to minors. The evidence against him was unbroken, and came from three quarters. Judge Merrimon instructed the jury that the evidence from either quarter was sufficient to convict. The jury retired, and eleven of them decided to acquit, evidence or no evidence! There was ever such impudence! Such unbridled audacity! Such disregard of law and order! But Judge Merrimon was equal to the emergency. For the week ending this evening (Sept. 30) the total receipts have reached 238,745 bales, against 187,740 bales last week, 126,041 bales the previous week, and 85,437 bales three weeks since making the total receipts since the 1st of Sept., 1886, 654,776 bales, against 389,325 bales for the same period of 1885-86, showing an increase since Sept. 1, 1887, of 265,451 bales.

The exports for the week ending this evening reach a total of 131,445 bales, of which 98,617 were to Great Britain, 128 to France and 38,700 to the rest of the Continent.

To-day an early decline was quickly recovered, and the close was dearer on a demand for open contracts. Cotton on the spot has met with a moderate demand from home spinners, and although stocks continued very small, quotations were reduced 1-16c on Monday and again on Wednesday. Yesterday good middling was quoted 1-16c lower. To-day there was a general decline of 1-16c, middling uplands closing at 9 1/2c.

The total sales for forward delivery for the week are 458,300 bales.

Cotton.
From the N. Y. Commercial Chronicle.
New York, Sept. 30.—The movement of the crop, as indicated by our telegrams from the South to-night, is given below. For the week ending this evening (Sept. 30) the total receipts have reached 238,745 bales, against 187,740 bales last week, 126,041 bales the previous week, and 85,437 bales three weeks since making the total receipts since the 1st of Sept., 1886, 654,776 bales, against 389,325 bales for the same period of 1885-86, showing an increase since Sept. 1, 1887, of 265,451 bales.

The exports for the week ending this evening reach a total of 131,445 bales, of which 98,617 were to Great Britain, 128 to France and 38,700 to the rest of the Continent.

To-day an early decline was quickly recovered, and the close was dearer on a demand for open contracts. Cotton on the spot has met with a moderate demand from home spinners, and although stocks continued very small, quotations were reduced 1-16c on Monday and again on Wednesday. Yesterday good middling was quoted 1-16c lower. To-day there was a general decline of 1-16c, middling uplands closing at 9 1/2c.

The total sales for forward delivery for the week are 458,300 bales.

Cotton.
From the N. Y. Commercial Chronicle.
New York, Sept. 30.—The movement of the crop, as indicated by our telegrams from the South to-night, is given below. For the week ending this evening (Sept. 30) the total receipts have reached 238,745 bales, against 187,740 bales last week, 126,041 bales the previous week, and 85,437 bales three weeks since making the total receipts since the 1st of Sept., 1886, 654,776 bales, against 389,325 bales for the same period of 1885-86, showing an increase since Sept. 1, 1887, of 265,451 bales.

The exports for the week ending this evening reach a total of 131,445 bales, of which 98,617 were to Great Britain, 128 to France and 38,700 to the rest of the Continent.

To-day an early decline was quickly recovered, and the close was dearer on a demand for open contracts. Cotton on the spot has met with a moderate demand from home spinners, and although stocks continued very small, quotations were reduced 1-16c on Monday and again on Wednesday. Yesterday good middling was quoted 1-16c lower. To-day there was a general decline of 1-16c, middling uplands closing at 9 1/2c.

The total sales for forward delivery for the week are 458,300 bales.

Cotton.
From the N. Y. Commercial Chronicle.
New York, Sept. 30.—The movement of the crop, as indicated by our telegrams from the South to-night, is given below. For the week ending this evening (Sept. 30) the total receipts have reached 238,745 bales, against 187,740 bales last week, 126,041 bales the previous week, and 85,437 bales three weeks since making the total receipts since the 1st of Sept., 1886, 654,776 bales, against 389,325 bales for the same period of 1885-86, showing an increase since Sept. 1, 1887, of 265,451 bales.

A False Prophet.

The Raleigh Observer gives the following instance of how easily colored people (men and women who can read and write) are fooled by sensational negro preachers:

"Sunday last was a day of immense relief to many colored people of the city. During the past summer a colored man named Henderson Crawson, has been prophesying that on October 2nd, the 'sun would refuse to rise, darkness would cover the earth and the wickedness would extract thousands of wild locusts which would sting to death all those out of the ark.' He said that God had told him to preach these things. A great many colored people devoutly believed him, and a tremendous revival was started, during which many 'got into the ark.' Some were almost wild with excitement, and were anxiously awaiting the time for dawn on Sunday morning, and felt happy as the glorious sun appeared with more than its ordinary brightness.

It appears that after the time for the calamity had passed, some of the new dwellers of the 'ark' thought they had been hauled in by unfair means and started out to hunt up Crawson and ask him for an explanation. They did not relish having lived several months in mortal dread without any cause. Crawson learned that they were looking for him and also had an intimation that if he was found, that there was no ark immediately near that would save him from some execrable stings—not the stings of locusts, however. This was rather dark-looking for him, and he at once left the city—probably to stay.

It is something to pity that he was not called to a severe account, though the colored people should not allow themselves to be concerned over such things as his prophesies.

Pauper Children.

How the English dispose of the surplus Juvenile population.

Since the publication of the fact of the detention of two little immigrants, Katie Baker and Minnie Peters, by order of the board of public charities, numerous applications have been received by Commissioner Biddle from people in different parts of the country, who expressed a willingness to take the little ones. However, as they are said by the Treasury department to be clearly among the prohibited classes they must be returned to England, whence they came. In speaking of the cases, which have excited so much attention, Mr. Biddle said that the children were sent to America by Mark Whitehall, a justice of the peace and superintendent of the poor in Bristol, England, to the Children's Aid Society of New York city, the agent of which, Mr. Brace, had been accustomed to receive pauper children from England, and he expressed surprise when the little ones were not allowed to land. The New York authorities had never refused to permit the children at that port, and not anticipating any trouble, Mr. Brace had already provided homes for them in Missouri.

At a meeting of representatives of charitable boards from all parts of the country held in Omaha two weeks ago, Judge Elmer, president of the Wisconsin State charities, denounced the Children's Aid Society of New York, stating that it was filling the West with pauper children who would sooner or later become public charges. The society claims that it frequently inquires after the welfare of the wards and sees that they are well cared for. In the first case which Judge Elmer investigated he found that five years before that a child had been adopted by a gentleman who lived in that vicinity. The gentleman died a year after he received the little one, and all traces of it were lost. Four years later the Society was evident of ignorance of the changes that had taken place in the meantime.

People frequently did not like the children after they got them, and then placed them in almshouses. The Wisconsin people are highly indignant and say that much dissatisfaction exists in other parts of the West.

Commissioner Biddle is in receipt of a letter from Secretary Brace, in which the writer states that his society sent 4,000 children yearly to Western homes. Mark Whitehall and his associates in Bristol have been regularly sending paupers to America. It is believed that the Treasury department will open an investigation in New York.—Baltimore American.

The Salvation Army in Bad Repute.

ATLANTA, Oct. 3.—The Salvation Army, which has been thriving in Georgia for a year past, has met with a series of disasters during the past month which has broken it up. The Rome encampment was broken up by the arrest of its leader, Henry Johnson, for attempted assault on Nate Maginnis, a child of eight years. The army in Griffin was rotten-egged, and one of the City Aldermen, Mr. George, is now under bonds for his activity in hurling the missiles. In Columbus and other places the leading female officers married and so scandalized the other soldiers that they would not parade any more. In Augusta the army was broken up by the desertion of its members, causing such indignation that the barracks is now empty. In this city Nat. Anderson, the leading singer, has deserted, and accuses his comrades of various unmentionable crimes. Four families have been broken up here by the army.

The newly elected Lord Mayor of London is not only a Roman Catholic but a foreigner by birth. He is, we suppose, the first member of the Roman Catholic Church who has attained the mayoralty of the British capital since the Reformation. The political disabilities under which Catholics once labored in England have all been removed, however. The Lord Mayor is elected from among themselves by the aldermen of the city, who in their turn are chosen by the Liverymen or members of the guilds and corporations. Mr. DeKeyser, who is the newly elected officer, and who is the senior proprietor, happened to be the senior alderman who has not already served as mayor, and the choice for chief magistrate fell on him in accordance with time-honored custom. The force and influence of time-honored custom in England we all know well.

Dr. W. M. Butler, in the Epoch, says that the least harmful method of smoking is a clean pipe with mild tobacco. He writes: "Whether smoking is good for a man depends on his organization. I do not think that smoking is ever really beneficial to a nervous man. Then, again, much depends on how much a man smokes, and when he smokes. There are certain men who, when they are tired, when their nervous system has been on too great a strain, will smoke one or two cigars they will become quiet. The nervous man should not smoke at all."

Dr. W. M. Butler, in the Epoch, says that the least harmful method of smoking is a clean pipe with mild tobacco. He writes: "Whether smoking is good for a man depends on his organization. I do not think that smoking is ever really beneficial to a nervous man. Then, again, much depends on how much a man smokes, and when he smokes. There are certain men who, when they are tired, when their nervous system has been on too great a strain, will smoke one or two cigars they will become quiet. The nervous man should not smoke at all."

State News.

CROPS, MAIZE, &c.—A valued friend at Elkin, writing us on business, adds: "I am just back from a trip through Allegheny and Grayson counties. I find wheat, corn and oats in abundance, and have never seen such a mass. The trees are loaded with acorns and chestnuts. The hogs are as fat as butterballs. The only trouble is there are not hogs enough to consume it. I suppose there will be thousands of bushels of chestnuts gathered for market.—Stateville Landmark.

No one has higher respect for the members of the present Supreme Court than we have. But they are men after all, and once in a while they do lose sight of the fact that this is a very busy world and that consequently the best style for legal opinions is that which uses the fewest possible words which will suffice to convey the meaning clearly and forcefully. Why use a dozen different expressions to convey one idea? Surely there can be no good reason for doing either of these things, and yet the cases in which these things occur are numerous.—Goldboro Argus.

The North Carolina Conference of the Evangelical Lutheran Tennessee Synod will meet at St. Martin's church, four miles from Stateville, October 27th, and will include the following Sunday.

DEATH OF MR. N. A. STEEDMAN.—The sad intelligence has been received of the death of the venerable Mr. N. A. Steedman, of Fayetteville. The deceased gentleman was one of the oldest and most highly esteemed citizens of the Cape Fear country. He had lived a long, useful and honorable life, and sinks to his rest ripe in years and good fruits and in the esteem and regard of those who knew him. He was the father of Hon. Charles Steedman, of this city, Lieutenant Governor of the State, and of Mr. Frank H. Steedman, also of this city, and was the father-in-law of Mr. Wm. H. Bernard.—Wilmington Review.

MR. F. M. NESBITT, of Coddle Creek, Cabarrus county, sends as several bolls of his cotton crop of this year. They are of extraordinary size, one measuring 5 1/2 inches in circumference, while the others are not far behind it. They came off a limb which had 30 bolls on it and from a stalk on which there were 90 bolls. The cotton was raised from the Duncan seed, which Mr. Nesbitt bought in Atlanta for \$5.40 per bushel. His cotton crop this year will make a bale to the acre. That is farming.—Stateville Landmark.

DEATH OF MISS BESSIE KERR.—Our community was greatly shocked on Thursday morning when it was announced that this highly esteemed lady was dead. Although she had been in declining health for some time, such a sudden termination of her life was entirely unexpected to her friends. During the past summer she spent some time at Blowing Rock, cherishing the hope that her failing health might be restored. But even the mountain climate proved unavailing, and a few weeks since she returned to Concord, her health completely broken. Miss Kerr was a grand-daughter of the late Judge Kerr, and was a niece of Mr. H. S. Paryear and Mrs. J. C. Gibson, of Concord. She leaves many friends here to mourn her loss. To her heart-broken mother who survives her, we tender our sympathies.—Concord Times, Sept. 30th.

At the late term of the Richmond County Superior Court, Dr. W. Waters, charged with shooting his neighbor, Mr. West, in Laurinburg, some three weeks ago, was found guilty. The Judge ordered to suspend judgment, on payment of costs, if Mrs. Waters would return to and live with her husband. Up to the present writing she has not gone near Mr. Waters. We have in our possession a letter from Mrs. Waters, and letter from Mr. Waters. Our mind is made up as to the straight of the trouble. We always sympathize with the weaker sex, and side with them, but in this particular instance the man has a part of our sympathy. We believe influences have been brought to bear on Mrs. Waters. The best thing, in our opinion, for her to do is to make up with her husband, and keep to the way of the old people.—Wadesboro Intelligence.

Senator Vance has accepted the invitation to deliver an address at the Chamberlain County Fair, in Fayetteville, on November 10th.

The completion of the Cape Fear & Yadkin Valley Railroad to Mt. Airy will open up to the east a large section of country rich in minerals and agricultural products. The Norfolk and Western Railroad will be built to the State line, leaving only a distance of four miles between the two great lines.—Fayetteville Observer.

State Treasurer Bain says the indications are that there is a considerable increase in the value of the property of the State as compared with last year. This is shown by reports from the counties so far received. The last Legislature reduced the rate of taxation from twenty-five to twenty cents per one hundred dollars' valuation of property, so that the amount of taxes, even at the increased valuation, will be smaller than last year. Treasurer Bain says that in North Carolina the taxes are now lower than in any other State according to population and wealth.

Some months ago the State Board of Agriculture voted the sum of \$1,000 to the survey of the Dan river coalfields. The people there put up another \$1,000. The thousand dollars voted by the department was paid last week. Work in surveying the region is to begin at once, and competent men have been secured to conduct it.

ON TO ASHVILLE.—A committee has assurances of the most positive character from the President of the three O's Railroad Company that if the people of Buncombe county shall give him the aid of \$100,000 in county bonds, he will connect his line with Asheville from Cranberry, passing through the county of Yancey by which he has already promised to the same end.

The Carolina Central road is completed to Rutherfordton. It cannot be content to rest at that point. It must move onward; and its course of direction depends very largely upon the action of the people of Buncombe. The committee has the assurance of a high official of the Carolina Central Company that if they have the aid of the county of Buncombe to the extent of \$100,000 in the bonds of the said county, the road will be extended to Asheville, otherwise it may rest upon such encouragement as may be given by other communities.—Wilmington Messenger.

[We hope the Carolina Central Railroad will be extended to Asheville.]

Hon. Jeff Davis' Letter to Senator Reagan on Prohibition.

Houston, Texas, Sept. 24.—An open letter from Jefferson Davis to Senator Reagan on the prohibition issue is made public here to-day. Mr Davis begins by scoring the Senator sharply for the construction which he put on the Davis-Labbuck correspondence. He says:

"I certainly have no claim on the people of Texas, but freely acknowledge my indebtedness to them, and having for many years felt a deep interest in their affairs, I might reasonably have supposed that I had an equal right to express an opinion upon them as that accorded to a Georgia negro who was imported by your party to influence the voters of his color, and who, it was reported, has been at one or two public meetings introduced by you to the ladies and gentlemen of Texas. This is to be viewed in connection with the allegation that the white Democrats had been defeated by the teetotal and negroes who voted against prohibition. In your zeal to support the doctrine of prohibition you cite the law against carrying concealed weapons, but here again the answer is potent. The law does not invade the right to keep and bear arms for private and public license, but the abuse of the right by such practices as benefits the assassin and the burglar, the invader of the rights of others. To carry out your weapon, and lead to crime, the sale, importation and manufacture of fire-arms and outlery should be prohibited, and thus wholly extirpate the vile use which would follow abuse by their possessor.

Among the instances you cite of the abridgement of personal liberty is the prohibition of the first parents to eat the fruit of the tree of life. But the fact of the Creator did not destroy the tree, so as to make it impossible that our first parents could eat of the fruit, but he rather left them as free agents to their moral responsibility, with a penalty attached to the violation of His command. They had their own personal liberty and were left to choose between virtuous obedience and simple violation of the law, given for their good. The choice of the Creator did not destroy the tree, so as to make it impossible that our first parents could eat of the fruit, but he rather left them as free agents to their moral responsibility, with a penalty attached to the violation of His command. They had their own personal liberty and were left to choose between virtuous obedience and simple violation of the law, given for their good. The choice of the Creator did not destroy the tree, so as to make it impossible that our first parents could eat of the fruit, but he rather left them as free agents to their moral responsibility, with a penalty attached to the violation of His command. They had their own personal liberty and were left to choose between virtuous obedience and simple violation of the law, given for their good. The choice of the Creator did not destroy the tree, so as to make it impossible that our first parents could eat of the fruit, but he rather left them as free agents to their moral responsibility, with a penalty attached to the violation of His command. They had their own personal liberty and were left to choose between virtuous obedience and simple violation of the law, given for their good. The choice of the Creator did not destroy the tree, so as to make it impossible that our first parents could eat of the fruit, but he rather left them as free agents to their moral responsibility, with a penalty attached to the violation of His command. They had their own personal liberty and were left to choose between virtuous obedience and simple violation of the law, given for their good. The choice of the Creator did not destroy the tree, so as to make it impossible that our first parents could eat of the fruit, but he rather left them as free agents to their moral responsibility, with a penalty attached to the violation of His command. They had their own personal liberty and were left to choose between virtuous obedience and simple violation of the law, given for their good. The choice of the Creator did not destroy the tree, so as to make it impossible that our first parents could eat of the fruit, but he rather left them as free agents to their moral responsibility, with a penalty attached to the violation of His command. They had their own personal liberty and were left to choose between virtuous obedience and simple violation of the law, given for their good. The choice of the Creator did not destroy the tree, so as to make it impossible that our first parents could eat of the fruit, but he rather left them as free agents to their moral responsibility, with a penalty attached to the violation of His command. They had their own personal liberty and were left to choose between virtuous obedience and simple violation of the law, given for their good. The choice of the Creator did not destroy the tree, so as to make it impossible that our first parents could eat of the fruit, but he rather left them as free agents to their moral responsibility, with a penalty attached to the violation of His command. They had their own personal liberty and were left to choose between virtuous obedience and simple violation of the law, given for their good. The choice of the Creator did not destroy the tree, so as to make it impossible that our first parents could eat of the fruit, but he rather left them as free agents to their moral responsibility, with a penalty attached to the violation of His command. They had their own personal liberty and were left to choose between virtuous obedience and simple violation of the law, given for their good. The choice of the Creator did not destroy the tree, so as to make it impossible that our first parents could eat of the fruit, but he rather left them as free agents to their moral responsibility, with a penalty attached to the violation of His command. They had their own personal liberty and were left to choose between virtuous obedience and simple violation of the law, given for their good. The choice of the Creator did not destroy the tree, so as to make it impossible that our first parents could eat of the fruit, but he rather left them as free agents to their moral responsibility, with a penalty attached to the violation of His command. They had their own personal liberty and were left to choose between virtuous obedience and simple violation of the law, given for their good. The choice of the Creator did not destroy the tree, so as to make it impossible that our first parents could eat of the fruit, but he rather left them as free agents to their moral responsibility, with a penalty attached to the violation of His command. They had their own personal liberty and were left to choose between virtuous obedience and simple violation of the law, given for their good. The choice of the Creator did not destroy the tree, so as to make it impossible that our first parents could eat of the fruit, but he rather left them as free agents to their moral responsibility, with a penalty attached to the violation of His command. They had their own personal liberty and were left to choose between virtuous obedience and simple violation of the law, given for their good. The choice of the Creator did not destroy the tree, so as to make it impossible that our first parents could eat of the fruit, but he rather left them as free agents to their moral responsibility, with a penalty attached to the violation of His command. They had their own personal liberty and were left to choose between virtuous obedience and simple violation of the law, given for their good. The choice of the Creator did not destroy the tree, so as to make it impossible that our first parents could eat of the fruit, but he rather left them as free agents to their moral responsibility, with a penalty attached to the violation of His command. They had their own personal liberty and were left to choose between virtuous obedience and simple violation of the law, given for their good. The choice of the Creator did not destroy the tree, so as to make it impossible that our first parents could eat of the fruit, but he rather left them as free agents to their moral responsibility, with a penalty attached to the violation of His command. They had their own personal liberty and were left to choose between virtuous obedience and simple violation of the law, given for their good. The choice of the Creator did not destroy the tree, so as to make it impossible that our first parents could eat of the fruit, but he rather left them as free agents to their moral responsibility, with a penalty attached to the violation of His command. They had their own personal liberty and were left to choose between virtuous obedience and simple violation of the law, given for their good. The choice of the Creator did not destroy the tree, so as to make it impossible that our first parents could eat of the fruit, but he rather left them as free agents to their moral responsibility, with a penalty attached to the violation of His command. They had their own personal liberty and were left to choose between virtuous obedience and simple violation of the law, given for their good. The choice of the Creator did not destroy the tree, so as to make it impossible that our first parents could eat of the fruit, but he rather left them as free agents to their moral responsibility, with a penalty attached to the violation of His command. They had their own personal liberty and were left to choose between virtuous obedience and simple violation of the law, given for their good. The choice of the Creator did not destroy the tree, so as to make it impossible that our first parents could eat of the fruit, but he rather left them as free agents to their moral responsibility, with a penalty attached to the violation of His command. They had their own personal liberty and were left to choose between virtuous obedience and simple violation of the law, given for their good. The choice of the Creator did not destroy the tree, so as to make it impossible that our first parents could eat of the fruit, but he rather left them as free agents to their moral responsibility, with a penalty attached to the violation of His command. They had their own personal liberty and were left to choose between virtuous obedience and simple violation of the law, given for their good. The choice of the Creator did not destroy the tree, so as to make it impossible that our first parents could eat of the fruit, but he rather left them as free agents to their moral responsibility, with a penalty attached to the violation of His command. They had their own personal liberty and were left to choose between virtuous obedience and simple violation of the law, given for their good. The choice of the Creator did not destroy the tree, so as to make it impossible that our first parents could eat of the fruit, but he rather left them as free agents to their moral responsibility, with a penalty attached to the violation of His command. They had their own personal liberty and were left to choose between virtuous obedience and simple violation of the law, given for their good. The choice of the Creator did not destroy the tree, so as to make it impossible that our first parents could eat of the fruit, but he rather left them as free agents to their moral responsibility, with a penalty attached to the violation of His command. They had their own personal liberty and were left to choose between virtuous obedience and simple violation of the law, given for their good. The choice of the Creator did not destroy the tree, so as to make it impossible that our first parents could eat of the fruit, but he rather left them as free agents to their moral responsibility, with a penalty attached to the violation of His command. They had their own personal liberty and were left to choose between virtuous obedience and simple violation of the law, given for their good. The choice of the Creator did not destroy the tree, so as to make it impossible that our first parents could eat of the fruit, but he rather left them as free agents to their moral responsibility, with a penalty attached to the violation of His command. They had their own personal liberty and were left to choose between virtuous obedience and simple violation of the law, given for their good. The choice of the Creator did not destroy the tree, so as to make it impossible that our first parents could eat of the fruit, but he rather left them as free agents to their moral responsibility, with a penalty attached to the violation of His command. They had their own personal liberty and were left to choose between virtuous obedience and simple violation of the law, given for their good. The choice of the Creator did not destroy the tree, so as to make it impossible that our first parents could eat of the fruit, but he rather left them as free agents to their moral responsibility, with a penalty attached to the violation of His command. They had their own personal liberty and were left to choose between virtuous obedience and simple violation of the law, given for their good. The choice of the Creator did not destroy the tree, so as to make it impossible that our first parents could eat of the fruit, but he rather left them as free agents to their moral responsibility, with a penalty attached to the violation of His command. They had their own personal liberty and were left to choose between virtuous obedience and simple violation of the law, given for their good. The choice of the Creator did not destroy the tree, so as to make it impossible that our first parents could eat of the fruit, but he rather left them as free agents to their moral responsibility, with a penalty attached to the violation of His command. They had their own personal liberty and were left to choose between virtuous obedience and simple violation of the law, given for their good. The choice of the Creator did not destroy the tree, so as to make it impossible that our first parents could eat of the fruit, but he rather left them as free agents to their moral responsibility, with a penalty attached to the violation of His command. They had their own personal liberty and were left to choose between virtuous obedience and simple violation of the law, given for their good. The choice of the Creator did not destroy the tree, so as to make it impossible that our first parents could eat of the fruit, but he rather left them as free agents to their moral responsibility, with a penalty attached to the violation of His command. They had their own personal liberty and were left to choose between virtuous obedience and simple violation of the law, given for their good. The choice of the Creator did not destroy the tree, so as to make it impossible that our first parents could eat of the fruit, but he rather left them as free agents to their moral responsibility, with a penalty attached to the violation of His command. They had their own personal liberty and were left to choose between virtuous obedience and simple violation of the law, given for their good. The choice of the Creator did not destroy the tree, so as to make it impossible that our first parents could eat of the fruit, but he rather left them as free agents to their moral responsibility, with a penalty attached to the violation of His command. They had their own personal liberty and were left to choose between virtuous obedience and simple violation of the law, given for their good. The choice of the Creator did not destroy the tree, so as to make it impossible that our first parents could eat of the fruit, but he rather left them as free agents to their moral responsibility, with a penalty attached to the violation of His command. They had their own personal liberty and were left to choose between virtuous obedience and simple violation of the law, given for their good. The choice of the Creator did not destroy the tree, so as to make it impossible that our first parents could eat of the fruit, but he rather left them as free agents to their moral responsibility, with a penalty attached to the violation of His command. They had their own personal liberty and were left to choose between virtuous obedience and simple violation of the law, given for their good. The choice of the Creator did not destroy the tree, so as to make it impossible that our first parents could eat of the fruit, but he rather left them as free agents to their moral responsibility, with a penalty attached to the violation of His command. They had their own personal liberty and were left to choose between virtuous obedience and simple violation of the law, given for their good. The choice of the Creator did not destroy the tree, so as to make it impossible that our first parents could eat of the fruit, but he rather left them as free agents to their moral responsibility, with a penalty attached to the violation of His command. They had their own personal liberty and were left to choose between virtuous obedience and simple violation of the law, given for their good. The choice of the Creator did not destroy the tree, so as to make it impossible that our first parents could eat of the fruit, but he rather left them as free agents to their moral responsibility, with a penalty attached to the violation of His command. They had their own personal liberty and were left to choose between virtuous obedience and simple violation of the law, given for their good. The choice of the Creator did not destroy the tree, so as to make it impossible that our first parents could eat of the fruit, but he rather left them as free agents to their moral responsibility, with a penalty attached to the violation of His command. They had their own personal liberty and were left to choose between virtuous obedience and simple violation of the law, given for their good. The choice of the Creator did not destroy the tree, so as to make it impossible that our first parents could eat of the fruit, but he rather left them as free agents to their moral responsibility, with a penalty attached to the violation of His command. They had their own personal liberty and were left to choose between virtuous obedience and simple violation of the law, given for their good. The choice of the Creator did not destroy the tree, so as to make it impossible that our first parents could eat of the fruit, but he rather left them as free agents to their moral responsibility, with a penalty attached to the violation of His command. They had their own personal liberty and were left to choose between virtuous obedience and simple violation of the law, given for their good. The choice of the Creator did not destroy the tree, so as to make it impossible that our first parents could eat of the fruit, but he rather left them as free agents to their moral responsibility, with a penalty attached to the violation of His command. They had their own personal liberty and were left to choose between virtuous obedience and simple violation of the law, given for their good. The choice of the Creator did not destroy the tree, so as to make it impossible that our first parents could eat of the fruit, but he rather left them as free agents to their moral